

### REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application.

Claims 1-21 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 11, 13 and 18 are independent. Claims 1, 11, 13 and 18 have been amended.

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

### Reasons for Entry of Amendments

At the outset, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered into the Official File in view of the fact that the amendments to the claims automatically place the application in condition for allowance.

In the alternative, if the Examiner does not agree that this application is in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered for the purpose of appeal. This Amendment reduces the issues on appeal. This Amendment was not presented at an earlier date in view of the fact that Applicants did not fully appreciate the Examiner's position until the Final Office Action was reviewed.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suh and U.S. Patent No. 6,141,003 to Chor et al. (Chor). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Without conceding to the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements in a method for displaying a menu of a TV, including automatically sizing displayed elements, including a menu element, to a size proportionate with the size of said two or more screens; and automatically resizing said menu element to a new size in accordance with the size of the screen on which the menu is displayed, wherein said menu element is easily discriminated by a viewer because of the new size.

Claims 11, 13 and 18 have been similarly amended. These features are neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art of record, including Suh and Chor.

In the Examiner's response to the Applicants' arguments, the Applicants are challenged to explain how a system which incorporates a dual screen/picture-in-picture mode, where the screens can be the same or different sizes (FIG. 3a-3e), where a screen mode is elements/icons being displayed on the screen are displayed on a different size screen (larger or smaller) without being automatically resized to fit onto the display screen selected.

Further, the Examiner has noted that the Applicants' own discussion with regard to related art states that when a screen is reduced, the characters and icons are also reduced.

On both issues, the Examiner's points are well taken by the Applicants. However, the Examiner's points only highlight the problem to be solved. Particularly, when the pictures are reduced (for example, in PIP) any text or icons are also reduced (including menu elements). In other words, now that the display area is small, the also-smaller icons and menu elements cannot be read (or discriminated) because their size has been reduced in proportion to the reduction in the size of the screen. Therefore, it is necessary to "up" the size of menu elements so that a viewer can read them easily. This problem is explained by the Applicants in greater detail on pages 6 and 7 of the original specification, and particularly in lines 15-25 on page 6, and in lines 1-7 on page 7.

As the Applicants' claims provide, it is not necessary to upsize the menu elements or icons in all cases. In other words, a picture on a PIP screen can generally be viewed pleasantly even though the text is small. However, if a menu is requested (menu key is input) and the small PIP screen is the screen of choice, a menu, or related icons cannot be read if their respective sizes have been reduced to sizes which are proportional to the size of the PIP screen.

Therefore, if a menu key is depressed, the menu icons or other elements must have a size at which they can be easily discriminated. The prior art of record,

including Suh and Chor, do not disclose or suggest a method for resizing these reduced elements to a size at which they can be discriminated.

Particularly, Suh fails to disclose or suggest a combination of elements in a method for displaying a menu of a TV, including automatically sizing displayed elements, including a menu element, to a size proportionate with the size of said two or more screens; and automatically resizing said menu element to a new size in accordance with the size of the screen on which the menu is displayed, wherein said menu element is easily discriminated by a viewer due to the new size, as recited in independent claim 1, as amended, and similarly stated in independent claims 11, 13 and 18 (as amended).

### Dependent Claims

Claims 2-10, 12, 14-17 and 19-21 depend, either directly or indirectly, on independent claims 1, 11, 13 and 18. Since neither Suh, nor Chor, discloses or suggests the above-recited features of independent claims 1, 11, 13 and 18, neither Suh, nor Chor, either singly, or in combination can render claims 2-10, 12, 14-17 and 19-21 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this art ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

### Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that

the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Percy L. Square, Registration No. 51,084, at (703) 205-8034, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By: \_\_\_\_\_

James T. Eller, Jr.

Reg. No.: 39,538

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

Telephone: (703) 205-8000

*JTE*  
JTE/PLS/mlr/gf

0465-0647P